



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/542,432

11/16/2005

Christopher Raymond Jones

05436/HG

2765

1933 7590 12/23/2009

FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC

220 Fifth Avenue

16TH Floor

NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708

EXAMINER

GODENSCHWAGER, PETER F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/23/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/542,432	Applicant(s) JONES, CHRISTOPHER RAYMOND	
	Examiner PETER F. GODENSCHWAGER	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-32,35,38 and 39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-32,35,38 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 29, 2009 has been entered.

Applicant's reply filed October 29, 2009 has been fully considered. Claims 20, 35, and 38 are amended, claim 39 is new, claims 1-19, 33, 34, 36, and 37 are cancelled, and claims 20-32, 35, 38, and 39 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 20-22, 26-32 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. (US Pat. No. 6,402,824) in view of Ajoku et al. (Intl. Pub. No. WO 00/04777).

Art Unit: 1796

Regarding Claims 20, 21, 22, 26, 31, 32, and 39: Freeman et al. teaches a method comprising adding a polyacrylic acid dispersant to a 75% by weight solids content slurry of calcium carbonate (9:60-10:5 and 8:40-55) and maintaining the slurry as a slurry (a composition in a homogeneous phase) for further use (12:34-36).

Freeman et al. does not teach the addition of a tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium sulfate or tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium chloride. However, Ajoku et al. teaches the addition of tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium sulfate or tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium chloride to dispersed pigment slurries such as calcium carbonate in papermaking (Pg. 2, Lns. 15-20; Pg. 3, Lns. 15-25; Pg. 4, Lns. 5-10). While the combined teaching of Freeman et al. and Ajoku et al. do not suggest adding the dispersant and tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium salt as a single composition vs. separate additions, it is noted that changes in the sequence of addition are *prima facie* obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results [see MPEP 2144.04 (IV)]. Freeman et al. and Ajoku et al. are analogous art because they are concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely additives and processing of slurries for papermaking such as calcium carbonate. At the time of the invention, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the and tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium salt of Ajoku et al. in the slurry of Freeman et al. and would have been motivated to do so because Ajoku et al. teaches that it is essential that pigment slurries, especially those of calcium carbonate used in paper products, have a very low microorganism count per gram of sample and the tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium salts act as a biocide in such compositions and are safe for the environment (Pg. 2, Ln. 29 to Pg. 3, Ln. 15; Pg. 4, Lns. 10-20).

Art Unit: 1796

Regarding Claim 27: Freeman et al. teaches that the acrylic acid has a MW in the range of 500-12,000 (8:55-60).

Freeman et al. does not teach the specific range of 2000-5000. However, as the disclosed ranges of Sarver et al. encompass the claimed range, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists for the claimed range (see MPEP 2144.05).

Regarding Claims 28-30: Freeman et al. and Ajoku et al. do not teach the specific or relative amounts of tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium salt and dispersant (Freeman et al., 9:64-10:5; Ajoku et al. Pg. 7, Ln. 19 to Pg. 8, Ln.10). However, it is common practice in the art to optimize the absolute and relative amounts of result effective variables such as biocide and dispersant (see MPEP 2144.05). At the time of the invention, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to optimize the amount of tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium salt added and would have been motivated to do so because Ajoku et al. teaches that it is well within the ordinary skill of one practicing the art to determine the effective amount of biocide for a given system base on various system parameters including size of the system, pH, types of organisms present and the amount of control desired (Pg. 7, Lns. 19-27). At the time of the invention, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to optimize the amount of dispersant present and would have been motivated to do so because Freeman et al. teaches that the amount of dispersant should be added as needed to achieve a minimum in slurry viscosity (9:64-10:5).

Art Unit: 1796

Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. (US Pat. No. 6,402,824) in view of Ajoku et al. (Intl. Pub. No. WO 00/04777) as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Ralston (US Pat. No. 3,336,221).

Freeman et al. in view of Ajoku et al. render obvious the composition of claim 20 as set forth above.

Freeman et al. does not teach that the dispersant is a tetrasodium salt of nitrilo-tris(methylene phosphonate). However, Ralston teaches a tetrasodium salt of nitrilo-tris(methylene phosphonate) for solubilizing/dispersing calcium carbonate (1:5-30; 2:25-45; Claim 6). Freeman et al. and Ralston are analogous art because they are concerned with a problem of similar technical difficulty, namely forming stable mixtures of calcium carbonate and water using organic dispersants. At the time of the invention, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the dispersant of Ralston to replace the dispersant of Freeman et al. and would have been motivated to do so because Ralston teaches that the tetrasodium salt of nitrilo-tris(methylene phosphonate) is effective at chelating and solubilizing/dispersing calcium carbonate (1:5-30; 2:25-45; Claim 6), and Freeman et al. teaches that the organic dispersant chosen may be selected from dispersants and dispersing aids generally known in the art for the dispersion of calcium carbonate (8:40-50).

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. (US Pat. No. 6,402,824) in view of Ajoku et al. (Intl. Pub. No. WO 00/04777) and Ralston (US Pat. No. 3,336,221).

Art Unit: 1796

Freeman et al. teaches a method comprising adding a polyacrylic acid dispersant to a slurry of calcium carbonate (9:60-10:5 and 8:40-55) and maintaining the slurry as a slurry (a composition in a homogeneous phase) for further use (12:34-36).

Freeman et al. does not teach the addition of a tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium sulfate or tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium chloride. However, Ajoku et al. teaches the addition of tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium sulfate or tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium chloride to dispersed pigment slurries such as calcium carbonate in papermaking (Pg. 2, Lns. 15-20; Pg. 3, Lns. 15-25; Pg. 4, Lns. 5-10). While the combined teaching of Freeman et al. and Ajoku et al. do not suggest adding the dispersant and tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium salt as a single composition vs. separate additions, it is noted that changes in the sequence of addition are *prima facie* obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results [see MPEP 2144.04 (IV)]. Freeman et al. and Ajoku et al. are analogous art because they are concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely additives and processing of slurries for papermaking such as calcium carbonate. At the time of the invention, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the and tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium salt of Ajoku et al. in the slurry of Freeman et al. and would have been motivated to do so because Ajoku et al. teaches that it is essential that pigment slurries, especially those of calcium carbonate used in paper products, have a very low microorganism count per gram of sample and the tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium salts act as a biocide in such compositions and are safe for the environment (Pg. 2, Ln. 29 to Pg. 3, Ln. 15; Pg. 4, Lns. 10-20).

Freeman et al. does not teach that the dispersant is a tetrasodium salt of nitrilo-tris(methylene phosphonate). However, Ralston teaches a tetrasodium salt of nitrilo-

Art Unit: 1796

tris(methylene phosphonate) for solubilizing/dispersing calcium carbonate (1:5-30; 2:25-45; Claim 6). Freeman et al. and Ralston are analogous art because they are concerned with a problem of similar technical difficulty, namely forming stable mixtures of calcium carbonate and water using organic dispersants. At the time of the invention, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the dispersant of Ralston to replace the dispersant of Freeman et al. and would have been motivated to do so because Ralston teaches that the tetrasodium salt of nitrilo-tris(methylene phosphonate) is effective at chelating and solubilizing/dispersing calcium carbonate (1:5-30; 2:25-45; Claim 6), and Freeman et al. teaches that the organic dispersant chosen may be selected from dispersants and dispersing aids generally known in the art for the dispersion of calcium carbonate (8:40-50).

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. (US Pat. No. 6,402,824) in view of Ajoku et al. (Intl. Pub. No. WO 00/04777).

Freeman et al. teaches a method comprising adding a polyacrylic acid dispersant to a slurry of calcium carbonate (9:60-10:5 and 8:40-55) and maintaining the slurry as a slurry (a composition in a homogeneous phase) for further use (12:34-36).

Freeman et al. does not teach the addition of a tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium sulfate or tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium chloride. However, Ajoku et al. teaches the addition of tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium sulfate or tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium chloride to dispersed pigment slurries such as calcium carbonate in papermaking (Pg. 2, Lns. 15-20; Pg. 3, Lns. 15-25; Pg. 4, Lns. 5-10). While the combined teaching of Freeman et al. and Ajoku et al. do not suggest adding the dispersant and tetrakis

Art Unit: 1796

(hydroxymethyl) phosphonium salt as a single composition vs. separate additions, it is noted that changes in the sequence of addition are *prima facie* obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results [see MPEP 2144.04 (IV)]. Freeman et al. and Ajoku et al. are analogous art because they are concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely additives and processing of slurries for papermaking such as calcium carbonate. At the time of the invention, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the and tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium salt of Ajoku et al. in the slurry of Freeman et al. and would have been motivated to do so because Ajoku et al. teaches that it is essential that pigment slurries, especially those of calcium carbonate used in paper products, have a very low microorganism count per gram of sample and the tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium salts act as a biocide in such compositions and are safe for the environment (Pg. 2, Ln. 29 to Pg. 3, Ln. 15; Pg. 4, Lns. 10-20).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see specifically Pg. 11, arguing that the composition of Fidoe is not a slurry filed October 29, 2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 20-32, 35, and 38 under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly found prior art references.

Art Unit: 1796

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PETER F. GODENSCHWAGER whose telephone number is (571)270-3302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on (571) 272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark Eashoo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/P. F. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 1796